

ORANGE BOOK FOR INFORMATION

Venue: Town Hall, Moorgate
Street, Rotherham.

Date: Wednesday, 11th December,
2013

Time: 2.00 p.m.

A G E N D A

1. Health Select Commission (Pages 17 - 26)
2. Self Regulation Select Commission (Pages 11 - 13)
3. Improving Lives Select Commission (Pages 24 - 31)
4. Overview and Scrutiny Management Board (Pages 22 - 34)
5. Improving Places Select Commission (Pages 11 - 16)
6. Reports for Information (Pages 20 - 38)

HEALTH SELECT COMMISSION
24th October, 2013

Present:- Councillor Steele (in the Chair); Councillors Barron, Dalton, Goulty, Havenhand, Hoddinott, Kaye, Middleton, Roche, Watson and Wootton, Victoria Farnsworth (Speak Up), Robert Parkin (Speak Up) and Peter Scholey.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Beaumont and Sims.

Councillors Doyle and Wyatt were in attendance at the invitation of the Chairman.

34. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The following Declarations of Interest were made:-

| | |
|-------------------|---|
| Councillor Steele | Partner/Governor representation on Rotherham Foundation Trust |
| Councillor Dalton | Member of Rotherham Foundation Trust |
| Councillor Wyatt | Member of Rotherham Foundation Trust |

35. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS

The following questions were asked by members of the public present at the meeting:-

“The Daily Telegraph had run a story last month about a number of NHS Trusts that had been paying £570,000 a year to agencies. I was disappointed that 1 of them was Rotherham Hospital. Since February, the Rotherham Foundation Trust had paid at least £40,000 a month for Michael Morgan at an annual rate of up to £570,000 for the services of his company. It said that the sum would pay the salary of 26 nurses and is more than twice the top salary paid to any permanent NHS executive. What have the tax payers of Rotherham got for their money? How is it justified paying more than other Trusts?”

Michael Morgan, Acting Chief Executive Officer, Rotherham Foundation Trust, stated that the Trust's website contained all the contractual information concerning both partners. He was not paid directly by the Trust; he was paid by Bolt Partners so the information from the standpoint of him personally was not correct. His job was to work himself out of a job as quickly as possible and would be leaving on 18th November when the new Interim Chief Executive would be taking up the post. Michael had been fulfilling the role of Interim Chief Executive as well as Chief Restructuring Officer. There had also been 4 other individuals as part of that contract that had been in the organisation since February, 2013.

Michael would provide full details or the website had the actual contract between the Trust and Bolt Partners.

The information contained in the newspaper article was not the salary for the Interim Chief Executive but was the amount of money paid to the whole turnaround team that had been brought to Rotherham Hospital. When Bolt Partners had joined the Trust in February, 2013, the Trust had been losing money in recent years.

The Trust had lost £6M in 2012/13, £6M in 2011/12 and £3.5M in 2010/11. It was now £0.5M ahead of the Plan and was projected to break even at the end of March, 2014.

“It had been reported in the local press that the Hospital was considering options as part of the action plan to Monitor. 1 option was the merger or acquisition of other Health Trusts. How developed are the plans and what discussions has the Trust had with other Trusts?”

Monitor had asked the Trust to look at all options for Rotherham Foundation Trust. There were 3 basic options that the Trust was looking at and that was part of the work the turnaround team had been tasked with by the Trust and Monitor:-

- Option 1 to continue the Trust as it was in its current structure under the current type of management

- Option 2 Increased vertically integrated type of organisation
 Currently there are acute and community services that were partially vertically integrated. A fully vertically integrated organisation would see patients taken care of in the community and the acute care trust, plus possibly closer work with social care, to move all the way through the continuum of care in a much more cohesive manner than at present.

- Option 3 Affiliation type situation.
 The 6 regional Trusts would be looking at what the best ways of working together were, not just for Rotherham but also for the other 5. Bearing in mind the large scale reduction in funding consideration would be given as to how that could be managed in a way that was safe for patients. Examples of current collaborative working are Rotherham cardiology patients going to Sheffield, patients from Barnsley coming to TRFT for ophthalmology and from Doncaster for ENT services.

The Hospital could not be closed as it would have a knock on effect on other hospitals and it a case of delivering the best care pathway for patients and keeping the Trust established as an excellent part of the community.

“When would the public be consulted on any merger/acquisition?”

The 3 options were to be considered by the Trust Board on 18th December. It was the Board who was the decision maker not Bolt Partners and the Governors would also have to approve the decision. Once the option was decided, consultation would take place.

36. COMMUNICATIONS

Janet Spurling, Scrutiny Officer, reported on the following:-

1. Cancer Care

The 2013 Cancer Patient Experience Survey and related league tables showed that the Rotherham Foundation Trust was the 4th best performing Trust in the United Kingdom around patients' experience of cancer care. This had been determined by analysis carried out by Macmillan Cancer Support of the NHS England survey data. The report as well as the local and national NHS England reports were available.

2. Women's Health Survey

The Women's Health and Equality Consortium were conducting a confidential United Kingdom-wide survey about women's experiences of using GP services, both positive and negative. The results would be presented to the Department of Health early next year. The Consortium worked to ensure that the experiences and needs of women and girls were reflected in Health and Social Care Policy and that public sector services were effective in meeting their needs, ensuring that they were safe from violence at home and in their wider community.

3. Indicative CCG Funding Allocations

Further information regarding the indicative figures showed that under the proposed formula (under review by NHS England), the 68 CCGs in the north of England would have been allocated £46 per person less than they received in the actual 2013-14 allocation and CCGs in the Midlands and the east of England would have received £39 more per head. The reduction for Rotherham would be 6.38%, just under £21M.

37. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

Consideration was given to the minutes of the previous meeting of the Health Select Commission held on 12th September, 2013.

Reference was made to Minute No. 25 (Domestic Abuse Injuries). This had been raised at the Local Medical Committee and would be taken forward and discussed at the Safeguarding Adults Board.

With regard to Minute No. 26 (NEETS), it had been clarified that 12-14 referred to academic year groups rather than chronological years.

Resolved:- That the minutes of the previous meeting be agreed as a correct record.

38. HEALTH AND WELLBEING BOARD

Consideration was given to the minutes of the meeting of the Health and Wellbeing Board held on 11th September, 2013.

With regard to Minute No. S30 (Locally Determined Priority), it was reported that re-commissioning work was taking place on Tobacco Control and Obesity.

With regard to Minute No. S31 (CCG Annual Commissioning Plan), it was queried whether it was known how much Rotherham was likely to receive from the recent Government announced Integrated Health and Social Care Fund and what it would be used for.

Resolved:- That the minutes be received and the contents noted.

39. ROTHERHAM FOUNDATION TRUST - UPDATE

Michael Morgan, Interim Chief Executive, Rotherham Foundation Trust, gave the following update incorporating clarification of questions by Select Commission Members:-

Staffing

- Louise Barnett had been appointed as the new Interim Chief Executive Officer and would be taking up the position on 18th November, 2013
- Jan Bergman had been appointed as the Deputy Chief Executive Officer and Director of Transformation
- 3 new Non-Executive Board Directors appointed – Joe Barnes, Lynne Hagger and Barry Mellor
- The complete team from Bolt Partners would continue their work in the Trust until the Board meeting on 18th December, 2013
- All of the Non-Executive Directors were in place; there was still another group of Non-Executive members that had been with the Trust for several years. The new Directors were interviewed by both the Board and Trust Governors and would not have been invited for interview if it had not been felt they had the experience for the tasks facing them

Options

- There was no preferred option. The Trust, like any other Trust, would probably prefer to move forward on their own without other changes but whether the organisation would be able to do that had yet to be seen especially with the budget restrictions
- There may be services between other Trusts in the region that would work better grouped together. Often Trusts had recruitment issues for specialist clinicians. It may be that clinicians worked between 2 Trusts similar to the current way of Rotherham providing ENT to Doncaster. This could be done under Option 1
- All services would be looked at and considered
- No discussions had been held with the Council as yet. The options to be considered by the Board in December are high level and would take a tremendous amount of work in order to get a 5 year strategic plan in place from January onwards.
- There would be a consultation process to ensure the community were fully informed
- Privatisation had not been put forward as 1 of the options
- Since the turnaround team had been in place, 75 nurses had been recruited. It had also been established that a further 35 were required. A recruitment drive was underway
- The proposed changes to the 11 CSUs had been implemented and now consisted of 4 Directorates. The 4 Clinical Directors would now sit on the Board but would not have voting rights but it is important to have clinical input.
- Rotherham was not alone in facing financial challenges. All the regional Trusts would have to work together and do so in a way that was good for patients that prioritised excellent quality of care within the amount of funding available through the NHS for each of the Trusts
- A specialist had been brought in to work on the Electronic Patient Records system. Rotherham was now well on its way to having such a system and would be much further ahead than others
- There would be additional car parking spaces for the Urgent Care Centre but it was not known whether there would be charges for parking

Michael was thanked for his attendance.

Resolved:- (1) That Rotherham Foundation Trust inform the Chairman in writing as to whether there would be car parking charges imposed for the new Urgent Care Centre.

(2) That a special meeting be held in January, 2014, to which the new Inerim Chief Executive Officer and Chair of the Rotherham Foundation Trust should be invited.

40. HEALTHWATCH

Naveen Judah, Chair of Rotherham Healthwatch, and Melanie Hall, Healthwatch Manager, gave the following presentation:-

- Healthwatch was a statutory body introduced by the Health and Social Care Act
- It was the new consumer champion for both health and social care
- Independent, influential and effective
- Gave citizens a stronger voice in influencing and challenging how health and social services were provided in Rotherham
- In part response to a number of reports – Mid-Staffs, Keogh Review, Berwick Report, Winterbourne Review
- NHS – A Call to Action – “This is all about neighbourhoods and communities saying what they need from their NHS; it is about individuals and families saying what they want from their NHS
- Rotherham Healthwatch structured around the 6 Priorities of the Health and Wellbeing Strategy i.e. Prevention and Early Intervention, Expectations and Aspirations, Dependence to Independence, Healthy Lifestyles, Long-term Conditions and Poverty
- Each Director had been allocated 1 Priority – all projects would fall under the 6 Priorities
- Links with CQC, Local Medical, Dental, Optician and Pharmaceutical Committees
- Additional projects would be undertaken as requested by partners or by issues raised through community engagement and the complaint process. Reports would then be submitted to the Healthwatch Board. If the Board agreed, a project and plans would be identified. Findings would be reported back to the Board, partner agencies and the Health and Wellbeing Board

- Healthwatch now occupied offices on High Street – open Monday to Friday 9.30 a.m.-4.30 p.m. and Saturday 10.00 a.m.-12.00 Noon. Its staff included 6 Directors, Manager, two Engagement Officers, Information Officer and Advocate. Volunteers would be relied upon. One of the Directors is a development role for a young person working across all the six priorities.
- Accessibility – looking to have drop in centres at Dinnington and Maltby as well as through social media and working with and through local groups.
- Met with CQC bi-monthly
- 3 issues had been escalated in the last month – 2 relating to health and 1 to Social Care. In the first instance Healthwatch would speak to providers and ask if they were aware of the particular problem in their organisation and give time to undertake remedial action. If an improvement was not made, the issue would be reported to the respective commissioner for further action. Healthwatch Rotherham sat within the Quality Surveillance Group for South Yorkshire and Bassetlaw CCG
- Healthwatch Rotherham’s data was reported to Healthwatch England and had to submit an annual report
- Rotherham was ahead of many others and was already seeing the impact of work that had been undertaken
- The Head and Wellbeing Board had been given the opportunity to submit a 6 month project that Healthwatch Rotherham could lead on. Any suggestions submitted would be considered by the Healthwatch Board
- Healthwatch had the power to enter any organisation unannounced if there were concerns. If the concerns were with regard to a care home it could be referred to the Council as commissioners of that service or referred to the Quality Surveillance Group. If no action was taken, Healthwatch could refer the matter to Healthwatch England who would go to the Secretary of State
- Health was promoted subtly but did not involve health promotions and would direct members of the public to where they could get the relevant information
- Due to the independence of Healthwatch it had not been felt appropriate to have Elected Members on the Board
- Any complaints had to be connected to NHS services

Naveen and Melanie were thanked for their presentation and for their help in publicising the scrutiny review looking at information for carers.

Resolved:- That a progress report be submitted to a future meeting.

41. URGENT CARE CENTRE

Deborah Fellowes, Scrutiny Manager, reported that the views expressed by the Commission on the Urgent Care Centre proposal had been incorporated into the full Council consultation response and submitted to the CCG.

The Commission's views and those of the Cabinet had been very similar with issues around access, car parking and transportation identified. However, the Commission had opposed the proposal and the Cabinet had supported it so the response submitted had been that the Council supported the proposal.

It was clear that there were some common issues had arisen from the consultation regarding accessibility to the new facility.

It was key now to ensure that sufficient weight had been given to the comments made and that the CCG had addressed the issues.

Discussion ensued on the consultation feedback with the following issues raised:-

- The CCG had investigated available bus routes to the proposed facility but it would depend upon which side of the Borough you lived
- Although the same number of car park spaces at the present location were guaranteed, there was already a parking problem at the Hospital without adding to it
- A number of organisations had raised queries which had not been answered as to the financial model. The question of whether the investment was financially sound and the best use of funds given the issues the Hospital had
- The consultation report had given a guarantee that patients would be seen in X minutes but had not said what "X" was. This was particularly relevant given the recent problems at the Walk in Centre when it had turned people away during the last 3 months as it could not cope with demand
- Should the Working Group reconvene to look at the consultation report?

Resolved:- That the members of the working group meet again to go through the published report and raise any issues of concern within the Council.

42. YORKSHIRE AMBULANCE SERVICE QUALITY ACCOUNTS

Janet Spurling, Scrutiny Officer, reported that the Yorkshire Ambulance Service would be attending the December Select Commission to give a presentation on their Quality Accounts. Their consultation process had commenced earlier than normal and responses required by 31st December, 2013. The information below had been submitted to enable Commission Members to give some thought as to their responses when they attended in December:-

YAS Quality Accounts

- Performance against last year's priorities for improvement (2012.13)
- Performance against the 'core' indicators (on which all Ambulance Trusts must report)
- A review of the quality of their services over the last year (2013/14)
- Priorities for improvement for the year ahead (2014/15)
- NHS111 Service for Yorkshire and Humber

2013/14 Priorities for Improvement

- Improving the experience and outcomes for patients in rural and remote areas
- Public education – increasing public understanding of when to call 999
- Improving their Patient Transport Service

2013/14 Priorities for Improvement

- Working with care and residential homes to improve understanding of when to call 999 and to develop alternatives for patients needing urgent rather than emergency care
- Achieving a reduction in the harm to patients through the implementation of a safety thermometer tool (a way of measuring how many patients are harmed in specific ways compared to the total number of patients receiving an ambulance response)

Core Indicators

- Red ambulance response times
- Care of STEMI patients
- Care of stroke patients
- Staff views on standards of care
- Reported patient safety incidents

Consultation Questions

- Service Quality Measures – proposal to use same measures as last year to aid comparison
- Plus new measure regarding performance on NHS111 call handling

- What does "quality" meant to you?
- Do you think YAS provides high quality patient care?

43. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING

Resolved:- That the next meeting of the Health Select Commission be held on Thursday, 24th October, 2013, commencing at 9.30 a.m.

**SELF REGULATION SELECT COMMISSION
21st November, 2013**

Present:- Councillor Beck (in the Chair); Councillors Atkin, Beaumont, Ellis, J. Hamilton, Mannion, Sharman, Vines and Watson.

Apologies for absence:- Apologies were received from Councillors Currie, Godfrey and Tweed.

27. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest made at this meeting.

28. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS

There were no questions from members of the public or the press.

29. COMMUNICATIONS

There were no items to report.

30. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 5TH SEPTEMBER, 2013

The minutes of the previous meeting held on 5th September, 2013 were deferred for consideration at the next meeting.

31. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

Resolved:- That, under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act, 1972, the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following item of business on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 3 of Part I of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act (as amended March, 2006) (information relating to financial and business affairs of any particular person).

32. BUDGET 2014/15 AND 2015/16

Stuart Booth, Director of Finance, gave a presentation on the approach to bridging the funding gap for the Budgets for 2014/15 and 2015/16, the timetable involved and the various options being explored.

It was noted that discussions were still taking place which would involve sensitive decisions being made with proposals having to be put to Elected Members for decision shortly.

The presentation highlighted information relating to:-

- Meeting the Budget Challenge – Update.
- Funding Gap 2014/15 and 2015/16 – Update.
- Revenue Savings Proposals.
- Meeting the Financial Challenge.
- Indicative Funding Gaps for 2014/15 and 2015/16.
- Summaries of the Savings Proposals as at 19th November, 2013.

The Strategic Directors were invited to explain each of their savings proposals in detail and the rationale behind each suggestion.

Joyce Thacker, Strategic Director for Children and Young People's Services, accompanied by Councillor Paul Lakin, Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families Services, reported on the five savings proposals.

The Select Commission asked a number of questions about the impact of these proposals, if they involved reductions in staff and the response to requests for a further review of some of the services.

Tom Cray, Strategic Director for Neighbourhoods and Adult Services, accompanied by Councillor Rose McNeely, Cabinet Member for Safe and Attractive Neighbourhoods, and Councillor John Doyle, Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care, reported on the various savings proposals from within the Neighbourhoods and Adult Services Directorate.

The Select Commission asked a number of questions about the rationale for the reviews, the impact of personalised budgets, justification for funding, demand, quality and flexibility, involvement of volunteers, staffing cohorts and the need to manage services efficiently.

Karl Battersby, Strategic Director for Environment and Development Services, accompanied by Councillor Amy Rushforth, Cabinet Member for Culture and Tourism, reported on the various savings proposals from within the Environment and Development Services Directorate.

The Select Commission asked a range of questions about the stages to reductions in base budgets, potential loss of income, increased community use of facilities and subsidies.

Stuart Booth, Director of Finance, reported on the various savings proposals from within the Resources Directorate.

The Select Commission again asked a range of questions relating to staff workloads and the impact on service delivery and the ability of some service areas to cover all expected of them.

The Select Commission also requested that as part of the next steps process consideration be given to moving forward with a small sub-group to look at potential savings by Elected Members.

Resolved:- (1) That Stuart Booth, Joyce Thacker, Tom Cray and Karl Battersby be thanked for their input.

(2) That the information as presented be noted.

(3) That consideration be given to the formation of a small sub-group to look at savings proposals for Elected Members.

33. DATE AND TIME OF NEXT MEETING

Resolved:- That the next meeting of the Self Regulation Select Commission take place on Thursday, 9th January, 2014 at 3.30 p.m.

IMPROVING LIVES SELECT COMMISSION
Wednesday, 6th November, 2013

Present:- Councillor G. A. Russell (in the Chair); Councillors Buckley, Clark, Dodson, J. Hamilton, Kaye, License and Read and Co-opted Member Mr. Mark Smith.

Apologies for absence had been received from Councillors Ali, Burton and Donaldson, and from Co-opted Members Mrs. A. Clough and Ms. J. Jones.

28. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST.

Councillor B. Kaye made a Personal Declaration of Interest due to his role as Chair of the Kimberworth Park Partnership in relation to item 32 (Families for Change).

29. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS.

There were no members of the public or the press in attendance.

30. COMMUNICATIONS.

The Senior Scrutiny Adviser (Scrutiny Services, Legal and Democratic Services, Resources Directorate) advised that the report of the Scrutiny Review into Domestic Abuse had been presented to the Cabinet. The Cabinet would respond to the Scrutiny Review's Recommendations within two-months.

31. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 18TH SEPTEMBER, 2013.

The minutes of the previous meeting of the Improving Lives Select Commission held on 18th September, 2013, were considered.

In relation to Minute No. 22 (Rotherham Local Safeguarding Children Board Annual Report, 2012/2013), an amendment was requested in relation to the section dealing with the Local Safeguarding Children Board's main areas of concern. The second bullet point stated that levels of neglect in the Borough were an 'emerging issue'. It was requested that this be amended to the levels of neglect were being addressed as a priority following identification in the Ofsted inspection of 2011.

The Chairperson of the Improving Lives Select Commission thanked the Clerk for the format and content of the minutes from the previous meeting, as they were comprehensive and outlined all of the information considered.

Resolved: - That, with the amendment as shown above, the minutes of the previous meeting of the Improving Lives Select Commission be agreed as an accurate record for signature by the Chairperson.

32. FAMILIES FOR CHANGE.

Councillor G. A. Russell welcomed the Families for Change Co-ordinator, the Workforce, Strategy, Planning and Development Manager and the Director of Safeguarding Children and Families (all of the Safeguarding Children and Families, Children and Young People's Services Directorate) to the meeting. The Officers had been invited to attend the meeting to update the Improving Lives Select Commission on Rotherham's Families for Change initiative.

Minute No. C23 (Troubled Families Initiative) of the Cabinet meeting held on 20th June, 2012, provided authorisation for Rotherham to undertake the Central Government's Troubled Families Initiative.

The Troubled Families Co-ordinator explained how Rotherham had re-branded the Central Government's 'Trouble Families' initiative to 'Families for Change' in order to emphasise the positive aspirations of the programme in Rotherham. A similar approach had been taken by other local authorities. No parts of Rotherham's workstream were delivered under the name 'Troubled Families', as the intentions of partnership and co-operation were guiding principles, and all provision was done 'with' families, rather than 'to' them. The Troubled Families' Co-ordinator had retained the job title to ensure clarity and accountability to the funding stream.

Rotherham has been asked to work with 730 families during the three year programme (April 2012 – April 2015); at this stage of the programme 415 families were working with Families for Change, including both the adults and children within the family.

Families were identified as being eligible to work with the programme through a number of criterion: -

- Education – children in the family being classed as 'persistently absent' with attendance figures of less than 85%, or who had been temporarily excluded three or more times in a year, or permanently excluded;
- Crime and Anti-social behaviour as factors in the family;
- Adult/s in the family claiming unemployed Benefits.

If a family displayed evidence of all three factors, then Families for Change would engage them through family support. In accordance with the Troubled Families Financial Framework, Rotherham had also elected to apply a local filter to concentrate efforts in the eleven most deprived neighbourhoods, and to identify families affected by factors including poor mental health, drug and alcohol misuse and domestic abuse.

Children and Young People's Services Continuum of Need, shows the services and provision available from the 'Universal' to 'Acute' stages was

referred to. The majority of the families that were involved in Families for Change were in the middle 'Vulnerable' and 'Complex' stages.

A map of the Borough highlighted the incidence of contacts with the Families for Change and how there was a high correlation to the eleven most deprived neighbourhoods.

Key aspects of the provision through Families for Change were the Family Intervention Factors, including: -

- A dedicated worker, dedicated to a family to 'grip their problems';
- Practical 'hands on' support;
- A persistent, assertive and challenging approach;
- Considering the family as a whole – gathering the intelligence;
- Common purpose and agreed action: All professionals working with a family were aware of the other agencies involved;
- The Family Common Assessment Framework in place for the family: -
 - Recognised a family's strengths and needs;
 - Appointed a Lead Worker, who was the co-ordinator of all provision and professionals;
 - Delivered a process for a managed 'step-down' of cases from social care into support from the programme.
 - There were close links with Deprived Neighbourhood Lead Workers, and links through secondment to the Job Centre Plus.
- The Family Recovery Programme contract was delivered under the Families for Change project, to provide intensive family support;
- A contract awarded to the YWCA provides a dedicated lead worker for the Family Common Assessment Framework as well as the family intervention factors.

The financial structure of the Families for Change programme was considered, including the differing loading on each of the three years for the attachment fee and the payment by results percentage.

Payment by results had to be determined on a reversal of the identification criterion: -

- Improved school attendance sustained over three terms;
- A reduction in crime;
- Adults in employment or on a pathway to employment.

The time-limited nature of the Troubled Families funding was noted. There had been no announcement about what funding would be available after 2016.

Discussion ensued on the issues within the presentation and submitted

report. The following issues were considered: -

- **Wasn't this just a Whitehall idea? How well is it working in practice; are families engaging and how long do they want to remain engaged?** – Working fantastically well for many families - the case studies included in the submitted report demonstrate this. Some families are much more difficult to engage but Services can often find a way to engage with them, sometimes statutorily. The first case study submitted demonstrated multi-agency working to help employment and school attendance. Engagement times could last between eight-weeks to twelve months'. The Families for Change initiative represented a sustainable way for professionals to work with families;
- **What other information is there to support whether the scheme is a success?** – Payment by results and audit and analysis of case files, including case studies. Wider evaluation will be led by Central Government. Long-term outcomes, sustained beyond payment by results, will be looked at relating to school attendance and attainment, presentation at Accident and Emergency and so on. Local work with the Safer Rotherham Partnership, will seek to evidence the impact of the work on anti-Social Behaviour within neighbourhoods.
- **Are we engaging with newly arrived families? Case studies? European Funding?** – Yes, if they met the criteria for Families for Change. After the first twelve months a Families for Change, a Co-ordinator with language skills was recruited. European Union funding- joining up all of the funding available, this is a continuing piece of work at the City Region. The financial Framework was already optimising European Structural Funding provision through Wiseability. There would be not ability to match fund or duplicate.
- **There are families that are too hard to deal with? Do we only work with families that attract funding?** - Absolutely not the case in Rotherham. Family Recovery Programme worked with 80 families per year. Rotherham was not only directing this intervention to families that would be classed as 'easy win;' but also working with families with complex and multiple needs.
- **City Region – how does Rotherham compare to other areas across the region? Alcohol audit – how do you do this accurately? Sustain over three-terms – what happens at 4th term?** Along with other local authorities a strong group of regional networks had been established to share good practice. Rotherham came 7th in Yorkshire and the Humber, who, overall, had the highest number of outcomes across the country. Rotherham was organised to counter its own challenges; challenges were different in larger cities. Public Health used an agreed tool that did not just look units of alcohol consumed but asked more detailed questions that relied on the skill of the professional completing the audit. It was key that a skilled professional delivered the questionnaire. Attendance across three terms, the Programme was not exiting from families just because payment by results objectives had been

met but was supporting families until they could sustain themselves through accessing universal services.

- **Difference between now and previous schemes? Families living in poverty – this will get worse, how will poverty be minimised given Welfare Reforms. Many jobs now available were temporary contracts on zero hours. Working families also need help.** Families for Change Co-ordinators will ensure that work-based initiatives were appropriate. This would include the individual being part of a process, engaging with professional support and learning the pathways to work. Case study demonstrated work, accessing skills and training.
- **Working together – different areas of the Authority can conflict with one another, e.g. fines to families may not be supportive in this context** – Families for Change were using a model that supported multi-agency working and information sharing protocols.
- **At three-year point there will be the skills and knowledge but no money for the initiative – how does the Local Authority retain the workers' skills and knowledge** – By alignment with other work and ensuring that succession planning was in place to sustain provision. A very good evidence base for this type of approach was being built up.
- **Pupil Premium** – welcome new funding stream direct to schools, the Local Authority was working in partnership with schools to deploy the funding. Analysis was being undertaken to look at the educational outcomes relating to the Families for Change initiative.

Councillor Russell thanked the Officers for their informative presentation and contribution to the discussion.

Resolved: - (1) That the report be received and its content relating to the Rotherham's Families for Change programme and referral routes, be noted.

(2) That the Improving Lives Select Commission monitor the outcomes and benefits of the Families for Change programme in one year's time.

33. PUPIL REFERRAL UNIT RESTRUCTURE.

Consideration was given to the report presented by the Strategic Lead, Educated Other Than At School (School Effectiveness Services, Schools and Lifelong Learning, Children and Young People's Services Directorate).

The report outlined the existing provision and the imperatives on the Local Authority and its partners to re-shape provision to better meet the needs of the children on the periphery and outside of mainstream education. The Charlie Taylor report on improving alternative provision and the School Funding Reforms (2013-14) were taken into account in the proposals.

The Cabinet had agreed on 16th October, 2013, that the proposed structure of streamlining the Local Authority's existing five registered Pupil Referral Units to two should be supported (Minute No. C93, Proposed Restructure of RMBC Pupil Referral Units).

The submitted report outlined the proposed structure for Alternative Provision across the Borough. The report outlined the proposed re-structured Pupil Referral Units: -

- GCSE courses would be available at both Units, along with appropriate vocational courses;
- Links to Further Education providers would be in place to help with planning for young peoples' future pathways;
- Fully qualified teachers would work in both of the proposed Units;
- The Management Committees of the Pupil Referral Units would ensure appropriate representation from all partners and 'host' school headteachers, with the aim of increasing accountability;
- Strong partnerships would be in place between the Local Authority, Schools, Barnardo's and CAMHS and so on;
- Primary provision was still under review;
- Premises strategy;
- From 1st April, 2013, the Department for Education's School Funding Regulations stated that Pupil Referral Units should have a Delegated Budget allocated from the Dedicated Schools' Grant;
- It was proposed that a commissioning structure would exist whereby school's would be able to commission places within the Pupil Referral Units, with appropriate funding being accessed from the High Needs Block and Pupil Premium funding as necessary, on a pro-rata'd basis between the home school and pupil referral unit if appropriate;
- A review of the existing placements would also be undertaken to ensure that they were appropriate and meeting the needs of the individual.

Discussion ensued and the following points were raised and clarified: -

- **The length of time that children were accessing alternative provision;**
- **The premises strategy;**
- **Working with qualified teachers and setting up a protocol between Schools and Units to agree transition back to mainstream schools;**
- **What were the risks of schools not buying-back?** This could lead to reduced income, as could an increase in the numbers of permanent exclusions from Schools. Protocols for working with academy schools and their governing bodies. PRUs had never been intended to work as permanent units for young people. The Local Authority was inspected on safeguarding, Children Missing Education and part-time timetables of its most vulnerable pupils;

- **Mitigation of risks and uncertainties;**
- **Consultation with all Councillors and the impact on Councillors' Wards: they need to understand what is being proposed.**
- **Financial sustainability of the proposed model;**
- **Moral responsibility of all schools towards all of Rotherham's young people;**
- **Improving all stakeholders' opinions of Alternative Provision and Pupil Referral Units.**

Councillor Russell thanked the Strategic Lead for Educated Other Than At School for her informative presentation and contribution to the discussion.

Resolved: - (1) That the report be received and its content noted.

(2) That the decision of the Cabinet to support the proposed structure (Minute No. C93 of 16th October, 2013) be noted.

(3) That a further report be presented to the Improving Lives Select Commission in twelve-months' time relating to the progress of the review and whether the changes were functioning effectively. This report should link in to this Select Commission's continuing work programme item on Children Missing Education.

34. AMENDED HOME TO SCHOOL TRANSPORT POLICY.

The Principal Education Transport Officer (Transport Unit, Streetpride, Environment and Development Services) introduced a report that outlined proposed changes to the Local Authority's Home to School Transport Policy, whereby the Local Authority's duty to provide free transport to and from school for eligible children was set out.

The Principal Officer explained that the policy was updated annually and presented the proposed revised policy from September 2013. He also explained the procedural issues that had led to a delay in the 2013 policy being circulated; the Department for Transport had issued the revised guidance in March, 2013, but this had been subject to legal challenges and withdrawn causing the delay.

There was no change to eligibility criteria in the 2013 policy. The draft 2013 policy marked in red where there were proposed changes which mainly related to clarification, and included a new section relating to the raised participation age.

Discussion ensued and the following issues were raised and clarified: -

- **Changing logistical and social factors** – new housing developments, shortage of school places in particular areas of the borough creating the need for families to travel to schools at a further distance to their home, reduced household incomes;

- **Section 2.6 (V)** - problems with mileage and safety of routes in a number of specific cases across the Borough;
- Shortest route sometime had issues relating to the narrowness and condition of the causeway, alternative routes being unacceptable and passing other schools along the route;
- Assessment of safe walking routes.

Due to the number of specific issues raised, the Chairperson asked that they be raised with the Principal Education Transport Officer directly outside of the meeting.

Resolved: - (1) That the proposed amendments to the draft Home to School Transport Policy (September 2013) be noted.

(2) That the draft policy be referred to the Cabinet Member for final approval as appropriate.

35. DATE AND TIME OF THE NEXT MEETING: -

Resolved: - That the next meeting of the Improving Lives Select Commission take place on Wednesday 18th December, 2013, to start at 2.00 p.m. in the Rotherham Town Hall.

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD
18th October, 2013

Present:- Councillor Whelbourn (in the Chair); Councillors Beck, Currie, Dalton, Falvey, Read, Sims and Steele.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Gilding and G. A. Russell.

62. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest made at this meeting.

63. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS

There were no questions from members of the public or the press.

64. PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT IN OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY

Further to Minute No. 61 of the meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board held on 23rd September, 2011, consideration was given to a report, presented by Councillor C. Read, concerning the working group of Elected Members, established to review the way in which public engagement in overview and scrutiny may be improved. The working group had focused principally on three areas:-

- : better use of new technologies and social media;
- : engagement with communities of interest and with scrutiny's co-opted members;
- : better use of press and communications to inform the public.

The report included details of:-

- : information from the Centre for Public Scrutiny
- : examples of the way in which other local authorities engage the public in the scrutiny process;
- : the use of new technologies, web-based technology and social media, enabling the general public to participate in the scrutiny process;
- : encouraging more public participation in the scrutiny process by means of an effective press and media strategy;
- : engagement with communities of interest, scrutiny's co-opted members, the Council's Area Assemblies and the Youth Cabinet.

The report also referred to the procedures used for the recruitment of co-opted members to the Council's Select Commissions (noting that statutory co-opted members are subject to other procedures). Members decided that option two (described in the report) should be adopted, ie: to maintain the current network of 'fixed' co-opted members, but not to recruit replacements whenever those co-opted members decide to leave. Use will continue to be made of the involvement of ad-hoc co-opted members

in specific scrutiny reviews, acknowledging the valuable contributions of co-opted members to the scrutiny process.

Resolved:- (1) That the report be received and its contents noted.

(2) That the potential of social media to increase awareness of Overview and Scrutiny in Rotherham be noted.

(3) That an examination be undertaken of the feasibility of changing the content and structure of Scrutiny web-pages to make them more accessible and 'issue based'.

(4) That an examination be undertaken of the feasibility of piloting the use of appropriate social media to support the work of Overview and Scrutiny.

(5) That the relevant guidance be re-issued in respect of Council protocols concerning the use of social media.

(6) That work be undertaken with Area Assembly Chairs to identify areas of joint working/shared concerns and they be asked to consider including a standard item on their agenda which outlines issues to be referred to scrutiny.

(7) That, as part of the scoping process, each scrutiny review shall consider its approach to press and communications in a planned way to ensure that there is capacity within the Communications and Marketing Team to accommodate any additional demands.

(8) That the scoping of each scrutiny review shall include a social media strategy, detailing how evidence may be sought from users groups and communities of interests or place.

(9) That, with regard to co-option, option two (described in the report) shall be adopted, ie: to maintain the current network of 'fixed' co-opted members, but not to recruit replacements whenever those co-opted members decide to leave.

(10) That appropriate information be made available for each scrutiny member, so that they are aware of the role of co-opted representatives on the Select Commissions.

(11) That the role of co-opted members be acknowledged accordingly and they be thanked for their input and contributions.

(12) That two Parent Governor Representatives be recruited to the Improving Lives Select Commission.

(13) That an update report be submitted to Members, in six months' time, on the implementation of the recommendations of this scrutiny review, enabling Members to determine the extent of any further action required.

65. SCRUTINY REVIEW OF DOMESTIC ABUSE

Further to Minute No. 63 of the meeting of the Improving Lives Select Commission held on 24th April, 2013, consideration was given to a report, presented by Councillor J. Burton (Chair of the Scrutiny Review Group), containing the findings and recommendations of the scrutiny review of domestic abuse services in Rotherham. The draft review report was also included for consideration by the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board.

The review had focused on the following areas:

- : what does a 'good' service look like? (drawing on national guidance and best practice elsewhere);
- : how well partners work together at a strategic level;
- : how well groups work together operationally;
- : How well the voices of the victim and their families are listened to.

Members discussion of this item included the following salient issues:-

- : commissioning and funding of domestic abuse support and services;
- : the impact of domestic abuse upon children and young people (a suggestion was made that the scrutiny review report be forwarded to the Youth Cabinet);
- : strategies for dealing with domestic abuse (especially the strategy of the Safer Rotherham Partnership);
- : prevention and early intervention; 'target hardening', eg: spending relatively small amounts of money on improved security for the homes of people who are vulnerable to domestic violence;
- : the issues of forced marriage and the 'so-called honour based violence' are to be the subject of a separate scrutiny review by the Improving Lives Select Commission during 2014;
- : the responsibilities of the various partner organisations, including the Independent Domestic Violence Advocacy Service (IDVA), the Integrated Youth Service and schools' governing bodies;
- : sub-regional links between domestic violence co-ordinators in the four areas (Barnsley, Doncaster, Rotherham and Sheffield), between IDVA Services and within the South Yorkshire Police; domestic violence is one of the priorities of the Police and Crime Plan prepared by the Police and Crime Commissioner; this issue will be the subject of further work by the Deputy Police and Crime Commissioner for South Yorkshire;

: the impact of domestic violence upon people with a disability and upon looked after children and children and young people who are carers;

: reporting and referral arrangements and the need to ensure that the various health services are resourced to make appropriate referrals of people who are the victims of domestic abuse.

Resolved:- (1) That the report be received and its contents noted.

(2) That the findings and recommendations of the report of the scrutiny review of domestic abuse services in Rotherham, as now submitted, be endorsed and be forwarded to the Cabinet for further consideration.

(3) That Cabinet be asked to forward the report to the Safer Rotherham Partnership and to the Health and Wellbeing Board for their consideration.

(4) That the Cabinet response to the recommendations be submitted to a future meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board.

66. CITIZEN'S ADVICE BUREAU

The Overview and Scrutiny Management Board received a presentation from Mr. David Sleightholme concerning the role and function of the Citizen's Advice Bureau;

The presentation included the following issues:-

: details of the impact of the economic downturn and the welfare reforms upon the demand for the services provided by the Citizen's Advice Bureau (eg: significant increase of client referrals, during the past four years, particularly with regard to debt issues (rent and Council Tax arrears and other matters such as Job Seeker's Allowance sanctions);

: the increasing workload of the Citizen's Advice Bureau, especially in advising people on ways of managing their income and expenditure;

: the targeting of services to people in those communities suffering the various effects of deprivation (most often concerning issues of housing, debts and benefits);

: the Rotherham Citizen's Advice Bureau receives annual funding from the Borough Council and also receives Big Lottery funding for its two-years project to introduce a holistic Advice Service, including new advice delivery methods;

: areas such as parts of central Rotherham and parts of East Dene, Dinnington, Maltby and Thrybergh are amongst the 5% most severely deprived areas within the whole of England;

: the use of the 'NelBooker' system of arranging appointments for clients with the Citizen's Advice Bureau and with other advice agencies (the system includes other appropriate agencies, enabling clients to access appointments quickly and within relatively easy reach of their homes);

: the 'AiR' network of advice agencies in Rotherham – and the need to increase public awareness of this network.

Members discussed the following issues:-

: the importance of locally accessible advice provision (eg: advice services at Kiveton Park);

: training for advice workers and ensuring that the Citizen's Advice Bureau and its services are 'fit for purpose';

: the importance of the entire network of advice services available to the public;

: the increase in referral of cases of debt in respect of utility services (electricity, gas, telephone and water); reference was made to voluntary agencies (eg: 'Stay Put') which provide assistance to people who have difficulty meeting the cost of fuel bills;

: the proposed increase in outreach work by the Citizen's Advice Bureau, which is currently the subject of discussion with the Borough Council; Members asked to be informed of further details of this proposal;

: the Borough Council's regular monitoring of the standard and quality of services provided by the Rotherham Citizen's Advice Bureau, for local residents;

: the Citizen's Advice Bureau is represented on the Council's strategic Welfare Reform Working Group;

: a suggestion was made that the Borough Council's mobile library might be used to accommodate the services of the Citizen's Advice Bureau;

: the incidence and amount of debt of people in the Borough area, including the problems caused by 'pay-day' lenders and by the increasing costs of food;

: details of the 'NelBooker' system and of the 'AiR' system should be available within the Borough Council's Customer Service Centres and be provided for all Members of the Borough Council and for Parish Councils.

Resolved:- (1) That David Sleightholme be thanked for his informative presentation and copies of the presentation be provided for all Members of the Council.

(2) That a further report about the role and work of the Citizen's Advice Bureau be submitted to a meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board in six months' time.

67. YOUTH CABINET/YOUNG PEOPLE'S ISSUES

Members noted that the 2013/2014 manifesto of the Youth Cabinet had been launched on Thursday 17th October 2013. Discussion took place on the suggestion that quarterly reports about Youth Cabinet issues be submitted to the Council's Cabinet meetings.

68. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 20TH SEPTEMBER, 2013

Resolved:- That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, held on 20th September, 2013, be approved as a correct record for signature by the Chairman.

69. WORK IN PROGRESS

Self Regulation Select Commission:-

The Vice-Chair reported on the recent activities of the Self Regulation Select Commission:-

: the scoping of the scrutiny review of the Council's commissioning and procurement processes and the way in which such processes could support the local economy (the review will examine the implications of the provisions of the Public Services (Social Value) Act 2012);

: the working group has been established to review the performance of the Council's Corporate Plan and financial strategy.

Health Select Commission:-

The Chair reported on the recent activities of the Health Select Commission:-

: presentation by the Chair, at the Council meeting on 23rd October 2013 concerning the scrutiny of health services;

: the report of the childhood obesity scrutiny review is being considered by the Cabinet;

: the scrutiny review of access to carer support services has begun (jointly with the Improving Lives Select Commission);

: the scrutiny review of access to GP practices will soon begin;

: at the Select Commission's next meeting, there will be a progress report on the review of the Rotherham NHS Foundation Trust and urgent care services.

Improving Places Select Commission:-

The Chair reported on the recent activities of the Improving Places Select Commission:-

: an initial meeting has taken place of the scrutiny review group of the local economy, with representation from the Self Regulation Select Commission;

: the scrutiny review of homelessness services has begun;

: consideration of Planning Section 106 agreements and the introduction of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL);

: grounds maintenance and housing repairs will be considered at a future meeting.

Improving Lives Select Commission:-

The Vice-Chair reported on the recent activities of the Improving Lives Select Commission:-

: the scrutiny review of access to carer support services has begun (jointly with the Health Select Commission);

: completion of the report of the scrutiny review of domestic abuse services.

70. CALL-IN ISSUES

There were no formal call-in requests.

**OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD
15th November, 2013**

Present:- Councillor Whelbourn (in the Chair); Councillors Beck, Currie, Dalton, Falvey, Gilding, Read, G. A. Russell and Steele.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Sims.

71. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest made at this meeting.

72. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS

There were no questions from members of the public or the press.

73. THE FUTURE OF TOURISM AND THE VISITOR ECONOMY IN ROTHERHAM

Further to Minute No. 141 of the meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board held on 22nd March, 2013, consideration was given to a report presented jointly by the Head of Corporate Communications and Marketing and by the Economic Development Manager, which provided information about this Council's current approach to tourism and how this could be taken forward as part of the work on producing a "Growth Plan" for Rotherham.

The report included a summary of this Council's relationship with and membership of the destination marketing organisation, Welcome to Yorkshire and the benefits of such membership.

It was noted that on 14th December 2010, this Council's Cabinet Member for Culture, Lifestyle, Sport and Tourism had agreed formally to withdraw the Council's tourism provision (including the subscription to British Resorts and Destinations). However, it was also agreed that this Council should continue its subscription to Welcome to Yorkshire, the official destination management organisation for the region.

The benefits to this Council of Welcome to Yorkshire membership include:-

- : the advantages of association with major national/international marketing campaigns;
- : the opportunities to contribute locally-focused editorial content to the "This Is Y" magazine;
- : the opportunity to benefit from networks, expertise, established links and credibility – eg: Gallery Town and links to the Hepworth Gallery;
- : access to market intelligence;
- : the potential to buy into regional campaigns.

During discussion, the following salient issues were highlighted:-

: the requirement for a thorough analysis of the costs and benefits of the Council's membership of the 'Welcome to Yorkshire' organisation, including the contents and extent of the service-level agreement;

: Rotherham's share of Yorkshire's tourism economy (according to figures provided by Welcome to Yorkshire); Members asked to receive further details of this matter;

: the Visitor Centre in the Rotherham town centre; its opening hours and training and duties of staff;

: the potential impact of the 'Visions of China' project (near to the Rother Valley Country Park), in terms of increasing the number of tourist visitors to the area;

: issues relating to the management of and the strategic vision for the tourism function in the Borough Council and the potential to generate income for the economy of the Rotherham Borough area;

: the need to facilitate maximum support for local attractions (eg: Wentworth Woodhouse; the Magna Centre; the Chesterfield Canal; Roche Abbey; the planned construction of the 'Steel Man' statue above the Tinsley viaduct at Kimberworth; etc);

: the impact of tourism upon the wider Sheffield City Region;

: the comparative importance of tourism provision, its costs and place in terms of the Council's core offer of services, against the background of reducing budgets.

Resolved:- (1) That the report be received and its contents noted.

(2) That the report be referred to the Cabinet Member for Culture and Tourism, for further consideration of the strategic approach to and the management and effectiveness of this Council's tourism function.

(3) That the further consideration of this matter, referred to at (2) above, shall include:-

(a) the way in which tourism and the visitor economy contributes to the Rotherham Growth Plan;

(b) an analysis of the costs and benefits of the Council's membership of the 'Welcome to Yorkshire' organisation; and

(c) a study of the resources available to the Council in respect of the tourism function.

(4) That this matter be given further consideration in respect of the place of tourism within the Council's core offer of services.

74. CHILDREN'S COMMISSIONER'S TAKE-OVER DAY (FORMERLY KNOWN AS 11 MILLION TAKE-OVER DAY)

Further to Minute No. 112 of the meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board held on 7th February, 2013, consideration was given to a report presented by the Scrutiny Manager concerning the proposed format for the Children's Commissioner's Takeover Day (formerly known as the Eleven Million Takeover Day) to be held during February 2014. The purpose of the Takeover Day is to give "...children and young people the chance to be involved in decision-making. Children and young people benefit from the opportunity to experience the world of work and make their voices heard, while adults and organisations gain a fresh perspective on what they do" (quotation from the Children's Commissioner for England, 2013). This event has been re-titled the "Children's Commissioner's Takeover Day" although the principles behind the Day remain the same.

Members noted that the date originally planned for the Children's Commissioner's Takeover Day was Friday, 22nd November, 2013. However, because of the examination commitments of members of the Rotherham Youth Cabinet on that day, the Takeover Day is being delayed until February 2014 (on a date yet to be arranged).

The proposal is that the Takeover Day in February 2014 will have two discrete aspects:-

- (i) examining the outcomes of the previous Takeover Day held on 7th February, 2013, concerning transport issues affecting young people; and
- (ii) the proposal that the Rotherham Youth Cabinet shall undertake a scrutiny review of services/support for children and young people who self-harm; it was suggested that the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board should appoint up to three representatives to participate in this scrutiny review.

Resolved:- (1) That the report be received and its contents noted.

(2) That the format for the Children's Commissioner's Takeover Day, to be held during February, 2014, as described in the report now submitted and including the proposed scrutiny review of services/support for children and young people who self-harm, be approved.

(3) That, at the next meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board, consideration be given to the appointment of up to three Members to participate in this proposed scrutiny review.

(4) That the Director of Public Health and representatives of the Child and

Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS) submit a report and/or presentation to the next meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board in order to raise awareness of the issue of self-harming amongst children and young people.

(5) That the members of the Youth Cabinet be invited to present the report of the scrutiny review of services/support for children and young people who self-harm at a meeting of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board be held during February 2014 (on a date to be confirmed).

(6) That, further to resolution (5) above, the report of the scrutiny review of self-harming be forwarded to the Cabinet and to relevant agencies for further consideration.

75. FORWARD PLAN OF KEY DECISIONS

The Chairman and the Scrutiny Manager reported on the requirements of the Council to prepare, publish and maintain a Forward Plan of Key Decisions, in accordance with the provisions of Section 15 of the Local Government Act 2000, Regulation 13 of The Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2000 and Regulation 9 of The Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Meetings and Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2012

Discussion took place on the definition of a Key Decision, in accordance with the Council's Constitution (as shown in paragraph 7, Part III of the Executive Procedure Rules) and on the monitoring of the Council's Forward Plan of Key Decisions, as part of the scrutiny function.

It was agreed that:-

(1) the Chairs and the Vice-Chairs of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board and of every Select Commission shall be provided, each month, with an updated copy of the Council's Forward Plan of Key Decisions.

(2) the requirements of the Council to prepare, publish and maintain a Forward Plan of Key Decisions shall be considered at the next joint meeting of the Cabinet and Scrutiny Members.

76. YOUTH CABINET/YOUNG PEOPLE'S ISSUES

The current issues concerning the Youth Cabinet had been discussed at Minute No. 74, above.

77. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 18TH OCTOBER, 2013

Resolved:- That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Overview and

Scrutiny Management Board, held on 18th October, 2013, be approved as a correct record for signature by the Chairman.

78. WORK IN PROGRESS

Self Regulation Select Commission:-

The Chair reported on the recent activities of the Self Regulation Select Commission:-

: the scrutiny review has begun of the Council's commissioning and procurement processes and the way in which such processes could support the local economy (the review will examine the implications of the provisions of the Public Services (Social Value) Act 2012); the issues of value for money and the definition of the local area are both important aspects of this scrutiny exercise;

: the scrutiny review has begun of the performance of the Council's Corporate Plan and financial strategy;

: performance management review has begun;

: the scrutiny review of the Council's budget will soon begin.

Health Select Commission:-

Both the Chair and the Vice-Chair reported on the recent activities of the Health Select Commission:-

: consideration of the NHS Rotherham budget and finance (including the proposed five years plan); a meeting is also being arranged with the recently appointed Chief Executive of NHS Rotherham;

: discussions with representatives of Healthwatch Rotherham, including that organisation's remit to scrutinize health services;

: continuing the scrutiny review of access to carer support services has begun (jointly with the Improving Lives Select Commission);

: continuing the review of Urgent Care services – including the examination of the report prepared by the NHS Rotherham Clinical Commissioning Group;

: the scrutiny review of access to GP practices is progressing and the scoping of the review has included an examination of the ease or difficulty with which patients are able to arrange appointments to see their GPs.

Improving Places Select Commission:-

The Chair reported on the recent activities of the Improving Places Select

Commission:-

- : study of Community Infrastructure Levy;
- : continuing review of grounds maintenance services;
- : continuing review of housing repairs;
- : continuing the scrutiny review of homelessness services;
- : the scrutiny review group has begun meetings, concerning the local economy and tourism, with representation from the Self Regulation Select Commission.

Improving Lives Select Commission:-

The Chair reported on the recent activities of the Improving Lives Select Commission:-

- : consideration at the recent meetings of: families for change; pupil referral units; transport to and from school; domestic abuse services;
- : the scrutiny review of access to carer support services is progressing (jointly with the Health Select Commission);
- : study of the coalition Government's Welfare Reforms and sanctions imposed upon benefit claimants by the Department for Work and Pensions.

Overview and Scrutiny Management Board:-

The Chair and the Scrutiny Manager reported on the recent activities of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Board:-

- : the review of sanctions imposed upon benefit claimants by the Department for Work and Pensions; the potential negative impact of such sanctions on families in need and on other vulnerable people; claimants who have received sanctions have contributed some of the detail of their experiences to the scrutiny review, including the direct impact upon their families; further meetings will take place with representatives of the Rotherham Jobcentre Plus; the report of this scrutiny review will be submitted to Members early in 2014.

79. CALL-IN ISSUES

There were no formal call-in requests.

IMPROVING PLACES SELECT COMMISSION
16th October, 2013

Present:- Councillor Falvey (in the Chair); Councillors Andrews, Astbury, Atkin, Ellis, Gilding, Godfrey, Gosling, N. Hamilton, Jepson, Johnston, Read, P. A. Russell, Sims, Swift, Wallis and Whysall; together with co-opted members Mrs. P. Copnell and Mr. B. Walker.

Apologies for absence were received from The Mayor (Councillor Foden), Councillors Dodson, Pickering, Roche and Vines.

21. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest made at this meeting.

22. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PRESS

There were no questions from members of the public or the press.

23. COMMUNICATIONS

There were no items to report.

24. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING OF THE IMPROVING PLACES SELECT COMMISSION HELD ON 4TH SEPTEMBER 2013

Resolved:- That the minutes of the previous meeting of the Improving Places Select Commission, held on 4th September, 2013, be approved as a correct record for signature by the Chairman.

25. PLANNING OBLIGATIONS (SECTION 106 AGREEMENTS) - UPDATED ACCOUNTS INFORMATION

Further to Minute No. 46 of the meeting of the Improving Places Select Commission held on 20th February 2013, consideration was given to a report presented by the Planning Manager providing an update of the agreements entered into by the Council in accordance with provisions of Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, the monies collected and the monies expended against the Section 106 account, in the period from 31st March 2012 to date.

Members noted that the earlier reports had detailed the comprehensive list of monies received by the Council, over the previous five years and had listed the monies received by individual Council services and the projects which Section 106 monies had been spent on during the same period.

The report stated that planning obligations (Section 106 agreements) are used as part of the grant of planning permission (normally major

developments) to secure community infrastructure to meet the needs of residents in new developments and/or to mitigate the impact of new developments upon existing community facilities. Benefits will be secured either in kind or via financial contributions, depending on the facilities which are required. The main areas to benefit are generally: affordable housing; primary and secondary education; urban green space; highways improvements; and public transport.

Reference was made to the work and role of the corporate group of officers which meets regularly to monitor, update and review the Section 106 policy and process and to consider any individual issues which have implications across the various directorates. In order that the group may also deal with the Community Infrastructure Levy in the future, it has been re-named the "Corporate Infrastructure Delivery Group".

The report detailed financial information, provided in three tables, in relation to the Section 106 requirements of recent planning permissions issued, monies recently received by the Council from Section 106 and monies spent from the corporate Section 106 account.

The Select Commission's consideration of this item included the following salient issues:-

: Section 106 contributions utilised by the South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Authority (which are also monitored by the corporate group of officers);

: the receipt of Section 106 monies, into the central account and the use of such funding;

: agreements made in accordance with the provisions of Section 278 of the Highways Act 1980 (which may be part of the development control and planning process, but are separate from Section 106 agreements).

Resolved:- (1) That the report be received and its contents noted.

(2) That a further report be submitted to a future meeting of the Improving Places Select Commission detailing the financial transactions of the corporate Section 106 account.

26. SCHOOL PLACE PLANNING

Further to Minute No. 193 of the meeting of the Cabinet held on 10th April, 2013, consideration was given to a report presented by the Principal Officer, School Organisation, describing the recent and future projects being undertaken to increase the availability of school places within the Rotherham Borough area. The report stated that school pupil numbers are increasing within the Borough and creating a shortage of places available in certain areas. There is increasing pressure on school places due to the numbers of pupils and it is necessary to increase the number of

school places available to meet the demand.

The Select Commission noted that the capital cost of the school building projects is currently met from 'Basic Need' funding allocated to the Authority from the Department for Education. Basic needs funding is provided for the provision of sufficient school places. Agreements made in accordance with the provisions of Section 106 of the town and Country Planning Act 1990 are also in place for some current and future developments in schools.

Reference was made to the detailed circumstances affecting specific learning communities and schools listed in the submitted report. Members noted the length of time taken in respect of the statutory public consultation affecting changes to the capacity of schools.

Discussion took place on the following issues:-

: new housing development in the Waverley area (affecting schools in the Brinsworth learning community) and the possible implications of the proposed development of the HS2 high speed railway;

: proposals to construct larger primary schools (eg: in the Waverley area) which have three-form entry of pupils;

: the number of primary schools which are full or over-subscribed in the Foundation Stage 2 (FS2); Members requested details of these particular schools;

: the increasing number of pupils caused both by the increasing birth rate and also new arrivals into the Rotherham Borough area; it was clarified that a 'new arrival', for the purposes of the admission of pupils to schools, is a pupil settling in the Rotherham Borough area from outside the United Kingdom;

: the arrangements for the admission of pupils to schools and the statutory guidance issued by the Government Department for Education; it was noted that approximately 1,800 new places for pupils have been created in primary schools in the Rotherham Borough area during the past eighteen months;

: Section 106 funding may be utilised in respect of academies and free schools.

Resolved:- That the report be received and its contents noted.

27. DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS FOR OPEN SPACES

Consideration was given to a report, presented by the Leisure and Green Spaces Manager, providing an outline of current and planned development of new policy governing developer contributions for open

spaces using the Community Infrastructure Levy and/or agreements made under the provisions of Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

The report stated that, currently, there is no formal policy regarding the use of Section 106 contributions for open space and play. However, the adopted Green Space Strategy (2010) recommended that planning policy should be introduced to help achieve proposed standards of green space provision through contributions from developers. Subsequently, draft open space policy (SP38) has been prepared and published as part of the consultation on the Draft Local Plan Sites and Policies document. This draft policy includes a recommendation that all residential development proposals will be expected to make a contribution to green space provision in line with the specified approach (as detailed in the report).

Members noted that the introduction of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) is a new way of securing financial contributions from developers towards the cost of providing associated infrastructure. As part of this new method, consideration has been given to the possible roles of CIL and Section 106 agreements in the enhancement of existing open space and ancillary facilities (such as play areas) and new provision where required, and their maintenance. A preferred approach was detailed in the submitted report, with a proposal that the green space contributions ought to be identified on the Regulation 123 List which will identify Rotherham's priorities for spending of CIL monies.

The Select Commission's discussion of this matter included the following salient issues:-

: the use of Section 106 and/or CIL funding both for the provision and maintenance of green spaces and public open space;

: the different needs of a new housing development (eg: in respect of education, transport and open space facilities) and the way of prioritising the use of Section 106 and/or CIL funding for the provision of such facilities;

: the identification of significant unmet demand for open space facilities, throughout the Borough area and the acknowledgement that Section 106 and CIL funding is unlikely to be sufficient to fund the provision of facilities which will meet that demand;

: the provision of funding for new play areas for children and young people.

Resolved:- (1) That the report be received and its contents noted.

(2) That the progress in respect of the introduction of a new policy requiring developers to make financial contributions towards the provision and improvement of open space and ancillary facilities be noted.

28. ROTHERHAM COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY - VIABILITY AND INFRASTRUCTURE STUDY

Consideration of this item was deferred until the next meeting, to be held on Wednesday 27th November, 2013.

29. SYPTE AND UTILISATION OF SECTION 106 FUNDING FROM ROTHERHAM

Consideration was given to a report presented by David Allatt (SYPTE) concerning the representations made by the South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive (SYPTE) in respect of applications for planning permission. Such representations ensured that new developments are incorporated within the public transport network and that use of public transport is made as attractive and easy as possible. The requirements of each planning application differ depending on the nature of development and the location and characteristics of the site. Therefore, a specific assessment and response is provided for each significant planning application.

Contributions from agreements made under the provisions of Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 are secured, as appropriate, to provide the necessary interventions to mitigate the impact of new development. Without this valuable mechanism, it is unlikely that developments could be delivered sustainably, or without placing a burden on public funds. The submitted report summarised the way in which the SYPTE has utilised the Section 106 contributions received.

Reference was made to:-

: the use of Section 106 funding to 'pump-prime' new bus service, or fund extensions to existing services, for new developments (sometimes involving a private agreement between the developer and the bus service provider);

: specific bus services in the Borough area which are funded by Section 106 monies;

: Section 106 funding is utilised for the construction of bus shelters and for the provision of Travelmaster bus tickets for residents; the aspiration is to introduce 'smart' travel cards (learning from the success of the London 'Oyster' travel card), which could enhance the monitoring of ticketing products;

: the need to maintain the surveys and monitoring of the use of the Travelmaster cards (which are provided to residents for a period of twelve months), in order to ensure the effect use of the Section 106 funding for this purpose; Members noted that, after the initial twelve months of free travel, a discounted ticket rate is offered for a further year; it was noted

that the SYPTE should monitor residents' continuing use of public transport;

: the desirability of extended research into the use of Travelmaster bus tickets; examples were cited of residents being provided with Travelmaster tickets (which are a South Yorkshire-wide product), even though bus services in their localities were relatively sparse.

Resolved:- (1) That the report be received and its contents noted.

(2) That a further report be submitted to a future meeting of the Improving Places Select Commission detailing the outcome of the survey and monitoring of the use of the Travelmaster tickets.

EARLY ACCESS OF PENSION BENEFITS
16th October, 2013

Present:- Councillor Stone (in the Chair); Councillors Sharman and Smith.

EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

Resolved:- That, under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following item of business on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 1 of Part I of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 (information relating to individuals).

EARLY ACCESS TO PENSION BENEFITS

The Panel considered an application for early access to pension benefits on compassionate grounds in respect of S.D.

Resolved:- That the early access of pension benefits in respect of S.D. be approved.

**COUNCIL SEMINAR
22nd October, 2013**

Present:- Councillor Lakin (in the Chair); Councillors Buckley, Clark, Currie, Ellis, Falvey, Goulty, Havenhand, Pickering, Pitchley, P. A. Russell, Swift, Wallis, Whelbourn and Wootton.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Ali and G. A. Russell.

ROTHERHAM INTEGRATED YOUTH SUPPORT SERVICE.

Councillor P. Lakin, Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families' Services, on behalf of Councillor M. Hussain, Cabinet Member for Communities and Cohesion, welcomed Chris Brodhurst-Brown, Head of the Integrated Youth Support Services (Schools and Lifelong Learning, Children and Young People's Services) to the Seminar. Chris Brodhurst-Brown had prepared a presentation that gave Members more information about the recent Service Transformation that had taken place, and the provision that was currently available across the Borough.

The making of the Rotherham Integrated Youth Support Service (IYSS): -

The Head of the IYSS provided an outline on how the Service how undertaken a period of Service Transformation: -

- The Service Transformation had been embedded in a clear identification of need and a careful and detailed consultation phase across all Stakeholders;
 - The final form of the IYSS was based upon need, what the people of Rotherham wanted and was set within the context of the best use of their "1/6d";
- The process merged the Council's Youth Service, Youth Offending Service and the Connexions Service, which had been returned in-house at the end of its contract;
- The IYSS had strong partnerships with a range of providers of Services to young people and families, including Schools, Families for Change, Voluntary and Community Sector projects, Colleges, CAMHS, South Yorkshire Police and Safer Neighbourhood Teams and the Safer Rotherham Partnership;
- The Service Transformation aimed to create a "quilt" of services and provision Borough wide;
- The Service Transformation resulted in ultimate savings of £1.5 million;
- The process took place in 2012/2013, and the Service was officially launched on 1st September, 2013.

Discussion ensued and the following issues were raised and clarified: -

- **Town Centre premises: young people's safety concerns and safeguarding relating to the MySpace building** – The Head of the Integrated Youth Support Service confirmed that continuing dialogue took place with the Manager of MySpace. Measures had been put into place to ensure that young people were collected or escorted when leaving MySpace in the evenings. The building was used for community cohesion work, a place where different generations could mix. The business plan of the YMCA's business plan and intentions for the premises was to run a building that could be accessed by young people and adults.
- **Was the Service optimising links with the regeneration of the area?** – This was continuing to be a focus of the Cabinet and the Senior Leadership Team.
- **Transfer of premises to Parish Councils: who had responsibility for ensuring that the premises remained open and providing services?** – The Head of Service confirmed that she had received complaint(s) in relation to the opening hours of a Youth Centre.
- **Could Elected Members who had undertaken training volunteer with the Service?** – The Head of Service thanked Councillor Falvey for her suggestion and agreed to look into this possibility.

A bespoke information pack was distributed to all Elected Members containing detailed information about the structure, key Officers and contact details of the Integrated Youth Support Service that operated in their Area Assembly.

Councillor Lakin thanked Chris Brodhurst-Brown for her informative presentation and contribution to the discussion.

Resolved: - (1) That the information shared be noted.

(2) That information relating to the provision of the Integrated Youth Support Service in each Area Assembly be distributed to all Elected Members.

**COUNCIL SEMINAR
23rd October, 2013**

Present:- Councillor Buckley (in the Chair); Councillors Ahmed, Clark, Ellis, Gosling, Kaye, Roddison and Wootton.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Godfrey, Hoddinott and G. A. Russell.

FIRE AUTHORITY.

Councillor A. Buckley, Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council representative to the South Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Authority welcomed Deputy Chief Fire Officer Mark Shaw to the Seminar. DCFO Shaw had prepared a presentation informing Elected Members on the areas under consultation for the Authority's revised Operational Plan.

Previous budget savings achieved: -

- Merger of Darnall and Mansfield Road Stations to the Sheffield Parkway;
- Replacement of Mosborough with Birley Moor Station;
- Small incident units;
- Closure of Royston and removal of Edlington on-call crew;
- Management of staffing reductions.

Currently undergoing a thirteen-week consultation period was: -

- Strategic and Operation Plans up to 2017;
 - The Plans maintained the aim to protect initial responses to emergency incidents and whole-time stations.
- Unless a significantly lowered budget was received: -
 - No loss of whole-time stations;
 - No further removal of rescue pumps;
 - No further changes to staffing deployment.
- Across the area, two whole-time pumps were operating on a 24/7 basis, it was proposed that this be reduced to one whole-time pump;
- Two pumps would be retained over-night on a resilience basis.
- It was predicted that the target of getting the first appliance to a dwelling fire within six-minutes would decrease by 4.6%;
- It was projected that a nine-minute response rate would be achieved within 80% of the time, in-line with current performance;
- The South Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Authority proposed to maintain efforts in education on prevention measures;
 - Fire alarms;
 - Fire retardant bedding for bed-bound smokers;
 - Sprinkler systems;
- Proposal to remove the response time target, and change to a risk-

based target, with a shorter time target for attendance in higher-risk areas;

- The Authority proposed to continue reporting and publishing the response time in-line with the six-minute timeframe.

Discussion ensued and the following issues were raised and discussed: -

- Deployment of part-time fire officers – this would be resisted by the South Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Service;
- How did the Authority signpost members of the public to prevention work? – Via each Safer Neighbourhood Team's community safety team;
- Strike arrangements;
- Highway access for pumps during rush hour periods;
- Fire Cadets – opportunity to win young hearts and minds;
- Earmarked and usable reserves of the Authority;
- Terms and conditions relating to night shifts, including access to beds and their replacement with chair beds.

Councillor Buckley thanked DCSO Shaw for his presentation and informative contribution to the discussion.

Resolved: - (1) That the information shared be noted.

(2) That information relating to the risk status of each of Rotherham's wards be distributed to all Elected Members.

**COUNCIL SEMINAR
30th October, 2013**

Present:- Councillor Smith (in the Chair); Councillors Atkin, Beaumont, Burton, Clark, Ellis, Hoddinott, Kaye, McNeely, Smith and Whelbourn.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Godfrey, Gosling, Goulty, J. Hamilton, Jepson, Roche and Sims.

ROTHERHAM VOLUNTARY BUS PARTNERSHIP

Consideration was given to a presentation from Andy Wright (Bus Services Manager) and Mike Nuttall (Network Development Officer) of the South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive (SYPTe) concerning the forthcoming establishment of the Rotherham Voluntary Bus Partnership. A briefing note and schedule of bus services was circulated for Elected Members.

The purposes of the voluntary partnership were to improve the bus service offer and the stability of the bus network, to make improvements to bus fleets and the highway infrastructure so as to reduce delays to bus services, improve reliability and punctuality and also to improve the ticketing offer.

The overall objective of the voluntary partnership is 'for bus travel to become people's choice of transport and maximise the positive effect of the bus on the environment'. The partners are: First, Powells Bus Co. Ltd., Stagecoach, TM Travel, SYPTe and this Council.

It was noted that routine changes to bus services and timetables usually occur four times per year, in January, April, July and October and the partnership aims to reduce this frequency to longer intervals of three times per year, so that service and timetable changes occur in January, April and September each year.

The partner organisations are expected to commit to improving the bus network in the long term; there will be major route and timetable changes occurring only once per year, on one of the pre-determined, fixed/set dates in either January, April or September.

Reference was made to the example of the Sheffield voluntary bus partnership, which began during October 2012. In Sheffield, major route and timetable changes now occur on a specific date in September each year and an improved network, reduced ticket prices and improved reliability and punctuality have resulted in an increase of 5% in passenger bus journeys during the past year.

The partnership acknowledges that bus tickets are expensive (especially for young people) and hopes to establish a more cost effective range of ticket options for passengers.

The balance which the partnership hopes to create is to:-

(a) obtain the commitment from the Borough Council and the SYPTE to invest in highway infrastructure, in order to speed up bus journey times and ensure that journey times are both consistent and predictable;

(b) encourage the bus operators to commit to fleet investment (renewing buses; improving the cleanliness and condition of buses; refurbishing bus engines to improve emissions, etc).

The public consultation exercise about the Rotherham voluntary bus partnership is taking place from Monday 4 November, 2013 until Monday 2 December 2013 and will include:-

- : a web-based internet platform, available for people to access the consultation on-line;
- : comments forms available at the transport interchanges;
- : drop-in sessions provided at various locations throughout the Rotherham Borough area;
- : information notices displayed on buses and in transport interchanges;
- : the publication of press releases.

Reports will be submitted to Elected Members after the consultation has ended. In Sheffield, after a consultation for changes on the first anniversary, there has been additional localised consultation taking place about specific bus services.

In respect of the funding of and subsidy for certain bus services from the public purse, Members noted that future budget reductions may impact upon the provision of these services. Every effort will be made to ensure that such funding reductions are kept to a minimum.

After the presentation, Members asked questions and raised the following issues:-

: the use of smaller buses – costs are similar both for the operation of smaller and larger buses; the large 52-seater buses are often full during the peak commuter hours; it is more economical to continue with larger buses throughout the day than to replace them with smaller buses;

: the public drop-in sessions – most are happening in the south of the Rotherham Borough area, because service changes will have more effect there; two drop-in sessions are being provided at the transport interchange in the Rotherham town centre;

: the withdrawal of six services (two affecting the Bramley-Wickersley area) – the drop-in sessions are not taking place in areas seriously affected by the proposed bus service reductions;

: the consultation ought to be wider, eg: making use of the Area Assemblies' public meetings; it was noted that the SYPTTE representatives would endeavour to attend these meetings, provided that sufficient resources are available;

: comments were made about specific bus services and recent changes which have been made (eg: to services affecting the Dearne area, where supply sometimes exceeds demand, because two bus companies are competing with each other); Members noted that there may be an opportunity to improve the ticketing offer for passengers travelling in the Dearne area, subject to the co-operation of the bus companies concerned;

: services affecting the Woodlathes Village, Flanderwell and Sunnyside are being reduced (a petition has been submitted concerning service number 4 affecting Sunnyside); the consultation exercise ought to include a drop-in session in this area;

: bus services to the Rotherham hospital ought to be improved, in part because the Urgent Care health services are being relocated from the Rotherham town centre to the Rotherham hospital site;

: certain other bus services are insufficient (eg: journeys between Thorpe Hesley and Meadowhall; the direct services linking the Rotherham town centre and the Barnsley town centre are minimal);

: reference was made to the subsidy (via the Passenger Transport levy) provided to support certain bus services; typically for Sunday services, for evening services and for bus services to certain rural areas of the Borough;

: Capital funding and Local Transport Plan funding (much of which is provided by central Government) assist in making improvements to the highway network, for the benefit of the whole travelling public, not only bus services;

: the longer term deterioration of bus services throughout the country (since the mid-1980s, other than in London); Members commented that sometimes bus services do not arrive at all and there is no explanation provided for the travelling public; should there be financial penalties for the bus companies in such circumstances ?;

: Members noted that it is important that the travelling public should submit complaints to the SYPTTE whenever bus services fall short of required standards, especially in terms of punctuality and reliability; it was suggested that a briefing note be submitted to the Transport Liaison Group explaining the complaints procedure;

: the lack of frequency of bus services during the evening;

: safety and cleanliness issues within the transport interchanges; some concerns about customer care and the helpfulness of staff; the SYPTE works closely with South Yorkshire Police to ensure acceptable standards of behaviour within the transport interchanges and the overall safety of the travelling public; it was noted that standards of cleanliness have been affected by budget reductions;

: making better use of the information screens and of tannoy announcements within the transport interchanges, particularly to alert passengers to any services which are being withdrawn or having their times altered;

: the integration of bus services and rail services; it was acknowledged that passengers prefer to make single journeys directly from place to place, without having to wait and transfer to a second bus or onto a train;

: Members expressed concerns about the contribution of the bus service operators to the Council's Transport Liaison Group and were sceptical of the prospects for the Rotherham voluntary bus partnership; further reference was made to the example of the Sheffield voluntary bus partnership which has enjoyed a positive first year of operation; Members noted the proposed governance arrangements for the Rotherham voluntary bus partnership;

: a suggestion was made that the role of the Council's Transport Liaison Group could be undertaken as part of the Council's scrutiny function;

: Members commented on the importance of the correct costing of bus services, in terms of both subsidies from public finance and also ticketing prices for passengers;

: a comparison was made between the transport regulation system affecting London and the system for other parts of the country; reference was made to the use of quality contracts (franchises for bus services) and the establishment of voluntary bus partnerships country-wide;

: reference was made to the importance of bus services and ticket prices to young people and it was noted that liaison was still taking place with the Youth Cabinet, as a consequence of the Eleven Million take-over day meeting (7th February 2013) which had considered public transport issues affecting young people in the Rotherham Borough area.

It was agreed that an up-to-date summary of the principal alterations to bus services will be provided for Elected Members.

Members thanked Mr. Wright and Mr. Nuttall for their informative presentation.

**COUNCIL SEMINAR
4th November, 2013**

Present:- Councillor R. S. Russell (in the Chair); The Mayor (Councillor John Foden), Atkin, Beaumont, Beck, Burton, Ellis, Gosling, Pickering, Roddison, R. S. Russell, Sharman and Wootton.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Clark, Godfrey, Jepson, McNeely, Sims and Smith.

HIGH SPEED RAILWAY HS2 - "ENGINE FOR GROWTH"

Further to the previous seminar held on 29th May, 2013, Members received a presentation from two representatives of the company HS2 Limited, Dan Barritt (HS2 Consultation Manager) and Rachel Blake (Community and Stakeholder Manager for Yorkshire) about the Government's formal consultation process on the route of the HS2 high speed railway from the West Midlands to Manchester and to Leeds. The consultation process had been launched on 17th July 2013 and would last until the end of January 2014.

The following summary of the consultation events was explained:-

- : events being held in 30 locations over 36 days;
- : there will be an exhibition about the HS2 railway at the Institute of Sport, Coleridge Road, Sheffield on Friday 8th and Saturday 9th November, 2013;
- : the intention to provide visitors with a 'walk through' of the proposed scheme and also to provide clear information about the impact (positive and negative) of the railway on the local area;
- : various specialists will be available to explain issues concerning: engineering works; the environmental impact; property issues;
- : there will be a 'welcome panel' and information about the case for HS2;
- : details of the proposed route, the main stations and the way in which the HS2 railway connects to local rail and transport services;
- : the provision of HS2 will release capacity on the regional rail networks;
- : "In your area" – maps of specific locations along the route (and visualisations of how the railway structures will appear at specific locations);
- : the use of GIS mapping technology to view precise locations;
- : High speed railways – information on the technical background:

- : Sustainability – the environmental impact and specific issues, such as noise from rolling stock;
- : Property issues (and the compensation scheme);
- : Timetable for construction and development of the railway route;
- : the next steps – after this consultation exercise has ended;
- : sound booths – enabling visitors to listen to a simulation of the level of noise which the trains will make;
- : Station groups (eg: the Sheffield City Region group)
- : Response forms may be sent to a postal address in Harrow (PO Box 1152); there are also on-line forms to complete www.hs2.org.uk.
- : the events will distill a large amount of information into a number of key points.

After the presentation, Members discussed the following salient issues:-

- : whether the HS2 project represents value for money for the Sheffield City Region; a principal benefit was explained that the high speed rail network will attract passengers who are making longer journeys, thereby creating space and capacity on the local and regional network for passengers making shorter journeys;
- : there will continue to be investment in improvements to the local transportation network;
- : time savings, in respect of journey times, are significant (not only for the longer journeys between the North of England and London);
- : in 2014, the Network Rail Chairman, Sir David Higgins, will take over as Chairman of HS2 Limited; reference was made to the importance of ensuring that the whole project will be delivered within the budget; it was explained that the much of the budgeted increase in costs were for contingency items;
- : difficulties of congestion and saturation of capacity affecting the West Coast mainline (linking London to Birmingham and Manchester) had dictated that the HS2 construction work would begin in London and move north; it was the Government's intention that the whole project (ie: the routes to Manchester and to Leeds, via Sheffield) will be completed and be within the scheme's budget;
- : the project budgets are defined (eg: information within a KPMG report) and both South and West Yorkshire will gain benefits from HS2;

: Members asked that more detailed information be made available about the impact of the route upon specific areas within the Rotherham Borough (eg: Catcliffe and Waverley); the representatives of HS2 Limited undertook to attend appropriate Area Assembly, Parish Council and community meetings, in order to provide such information to local residents and organisations;

: the construction timetable remained as work beginning in 2022, with the first train arriving at the new station in Leeds in 2033; the Government will have to decide if this timescale is to be shorter;

: the original proposal remains that a new rail station will be constructed above the existing transport interchange at Meadowhall (although Sheffield City Council prefers a location close to the city centre);

: the South Yorkshire Integrated Transport Authority has already announced its support for the construction of the new station at Meadowhall;

: reference was made to the impact of any future reductions in local bus services;

: the proposed route of HS2 remains unchanged;

: Members emphasised that the Holmes Chord (railway line), serving the Rotherham Central rail station, should be preserved within the local rail network and that proposals for the construction of dual lines should proceed.

Mr. Barritt and Mrs. Blake were thanked for the presentation.

**COUNCIL SEMINAR
19th November, 2013**

Present:- Councillor Sharman (in the Chair); The Mayor (Councillor John Foden) and Councillors Ali, Atkin, Beaumont, Dalton, Ellis, Goult, Kaye, Pickering, Pitchley, Read, G. A. Russell, P. A. Russell, Steele, Swift, Wallis and Wootton.

Apologies for absence had been received from Councillors Hoddinott and Smith.

THE COUNCIL'S WEBSITE.

Councillor T. Sharman, Acting Deputy Leader, introduced Tracy Holmes, Head of Corporate Communications and Marketing, and Jon Ashton, On-line Services Manager, to the Seminar. Tracy and Jon had prepared a presentation in relation to recent and planned developments to Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council's website.

Website usage: -

Customer access strategy: -

- Face-to-face, telephone and internet methods of communicating with customers;
- JADU;
- Editorial guidelines, content strategy;
- **Costs of each customer access** – face-to-face - £15, telephone - £7, corporate website – 0.42p, therefore, a strong business case existed to increase the use and scope of the website;
- Press releases and social media.

High level statistics: -

- In 2010 the website got 60,000 visits per month, in 2013 100,000 visitors came to the Council's website;
 - Pages viewed each month – 2000,000 in 2013;
 - Forms completed – 2010 – 1000 per month, 2013 - 2,500 per month;
 - Property bids – in 2010 – 5000 per month, in 2013 – 8000 per month;

Using the website and searching and navigation: -

- Rotherham sought to organise its website with search terms preferred by customers – for example 'bin' rather than the industry's preferred term 'recycling receptacle';
- Using a search engine weighted to customer needs;
- Rotherham's website currently had 10,000+ pages of content;
- The industry standard was to make everything accessible with only three clicks;

- Rotherham's website had 11 'top level' categories, but employed a 'top task' based homepage. Searches on housing, bin collections and jobs accounted for 50% of traffic on the website;
- Central Government List was used to categorise the website and this could make it more challenging for customers to use than other websites;
- Where things were placed could be confusing for customers, for example, single person's discount information was not in the council tax section, but stored under benefits.

Understanding customers and how they use our/any website and content strategy: -

- Many High Street stores have gone out of business, but the brands with an on-line presence have managed to adapt and thrive;
- An on-line presence was very important;
- Innovate, adapt and deliver value via on-line;
- Did the website exist as a primary way of gaining contact details? The Council should not direct people away from the website once they had decided to use it;
- 'Content is king' – customer should drive content;
- Appropriate content in the appropriate place;
- Easy read – plain English should be used avoiding jargon and waffle;
- Short bursts of content – 'mobile first approach';
- Attention-seeking methods and layout;
- Links, bullet points, sub-headings.

News and events and how we get good news out to people: -

- News – including the Christmas light switch-on;
- News distributed by email on a Friday to 6,500 registered people;
- Town centre user group emails to a further 2,000 users of the Town Centre;
- Social media methods reach 7,500 (the tweet was 're-tweeted' 17 times);
- The news had reached 200,000+ users;
- This compared with 224 hits on website page relating to the lights switch-on.

Future developments for the website: -

- Website upgrade in March 2014;
- Your Account – would be a self-serve consolidation of the amount of accounts used, including reduction in the number of passwords required;
- Mobile content would be available, so the website view would be optimised for different methods of viewing the information, such as by mobile phone, tablet and so on;

- Community Map – a range of services would be accessible by a map, for example, surgery information, providing a link to partners, and police crime data;
- Integrated housing management;
- News and alerts – the Council would automatically email alerts, Twitter updates and Facebook updates, when it had been told that someone had an interest in a particular area, such as a school closure.

Discussion ensued and the following questions were raised: -

- **Can the website follow-up if people could not find what they needed via the website?** - Yes, each page has a link to comment on content. Data demonstrating where people cannot access what they need can be analysed but it is time- and resource-consuming.
- **Technology is good if it worked. Council laptops can be slow and frustrating. Was the website accessible for people with disabilities such as dyslexia?** The laptop in question may need to be refreshed. However, the website will be speeded up. 10,000 pages of content should be streamlined to 2,000. On every page there is an accessibility option at the top right hand corner to change colour, font size and so on. The website did not push towards this as many people used their own accessibility devices and software.
- **If spelling is not spot on searches could fail or be useless** – this should not be the case as the website's search engine is Google, which takes account of mis-spelt words.
- **The Planning section of the website was hard to use, especially searching and the maps** – This was noted by the Officers.
- **Were training opportunities available?** There was the ability to provide drop-in sessions if there was sufficient interest amongst Elected Members.
- **Would the new website have links to social media to 're-tweet', 'like' and 'share' with friends and contacts? This would be a useful way of sharing good news stories** - More channels would make it harder to manage content. The new website would have links to social media.
- **The general public - some people were very nervous about using websites, was there anything in place for people who needed additional help?** – Options including on-line web chat were being explored. The potential existed, but resources were needed to actually implement these ideas.
- **The website was brilliant compared to the previous one, but the telephone directory was often not up to date** - The 'Contact Us' page promoted the 'golden numbers', but it was the intention of the website to solve queries on-line, rather than directing to a telephone number. With regards to the intranet

phone directory, the Officers agreed to take the feedback back to Corporate Information Technology Service.

Councillor Sharman thanked Jon and Tracy for their informative presentation and contribution to the discussion.

Resolved: - (1) That the information shared be noted.

(2) That the presentation slides be circulated to all Elected Members.

**COUNCIL SEMINAR
26th November, 2013**

Present:- Councillor McNeely (in the Chair); Councillors Ahmed, Atkin, Beaumont, Buckley, Falvey, Godfrey, Goult, J. Hamilton, N. Hamilton, Kaye, McNeely, Read, Sims and Whelbourn.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Clark, Ellis, Lelliott, Pitchley and Smith.

PROPOSED HOUSING ALLOCATION POLICY CHANGES.

Members received a presentation from Sandra Tolley (Housing Options Manager) about the proposed changes to the Council's housing allocations policy. The review of the policy had begun during the Autumn 2012 and the revised policy would be implemented during the Summer, 2014, subject to Council approval.

The presentation included the following salient issues:-

- there are 25,000 Council houses;
- outcome of the consultation process
- increasing demand for social housing;
- ensuring the allocation of housing to people who are in the greatest need;
- implications of relevant legislation – Housing Act 1996; Homelessness Act 2002 and the local rules afforded by the Localism Act 2011;
- the Council's fair and flexible policy (amended in January 2010);
- the operation of the 'open' Housing Register;
- naming of the groups – Priority plus; Priority; General plus and General - re-title the groups to numbered groups 1, 2 and 3;
- the view that Council housing should be available for local people;
- the use of the qualifying criteria, to join the Housing Register – the view of
- the coalition Government that people should have a local connection before
- being allocated a Council house (there are some limited exceptions to this
- rule);
- other qualifying criteria (e.g.: service tenancies, where accommodation is
- provided as part of a contract of employment);
- tenants seeking to transfer to another Council house, who have breaches of their tenancy agreement; the rules relating to applications for transfer;
- specific rules relating to Armed Forces personnel;
- rent arrears policy – changing the '13 weeks' rule to one where tenants having to reduce their rent arrears by 25% before being considered for transfer;

- no longer undertaking annual reviews;
- encouraging tenants to pay rent by either direct debit or standing order;
- means of ensuring that tenants are able to afford paying rent, so as to
- achieve long-term, sustainable lettings;
- the implications of the coalition Government's under-occupancy Rules (the 'bedroom tax,);
- communicating the policy changes effectively, including the use of Internet communications and public 'drop-in' sessions;
- the use of the Council's ICT systems for processing applications for housing tenancies.

After the presentation, Members discussed the following issues:-

- the proportion of persons from outside the Borough area who obtain a housing tenancy with the Council;
- the implications of the coalition Government's Welfare Reforms;
- public consultation about the proposed changes to the allocations policy, which has been very wide-ranging;
- people who accept tenancies of properties in the private rented sector may be removed from the Council's Housing Register; such persons may be re-registered after two years, in accordance with legislation relating to homelessness;
- tenants who wish to move to smaller properties (referred to as 'down-sizing');
- such tenants will be categorized in Band 1;
- confirmation that housing need is the priority in terms of allocation;
- the role of the Housing Assessment Panel and appeals against the refusal of applications for housing tenancies;
- capacity issues – affecting the type(s) of properties for which tenants and prospective tenants apply;
- comparisons with the housing allocations policies of registered social landlords;
- issues concerning people who move house very frequently;
- the needs of vulnerable people and families and also of people who have specific medical conditions and needs;
- the 'local connection' refers to people already living within the Rotherham Borough area – and have done so for a continuous period of three years;
- communicating the policy changes and publishing a fact-sheet which will dispel and incorrect myths and rumours about the allocations policy;
- the practice of the private rented sector in offering initial housing tenancies only for a period of six months, rather than twelve months;
- the Council's proposed policy for the registration of private-sector landlords;
- tenants registered with the Rotherham Bond Guarantee Scheme Limited (the ROBOND homeless charity) and their applications for tenancies in the private rented sector;

- the division of rent arrears debts between persons who have separated and who owe Council housing rent arrears.

Mrs. Tolley was thanked for her informative presentation.